REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action of March 18, 2008 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies in payment to Deposit Account 50-0951.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

In the Office Action, Claims 1-5, 9, 11, 13-18, 20, 22-28, 30, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Patent Application 2002/0047550 to Tanada (hereinafter Tanada). Claims 10, 21, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanada in view of U.S. Patent 6,121,949 to Ramamurthy (hereinafter Ramamurthy). Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanada in view of U.S. Patent 6,836,260 to Cok (hereinafter Cok).

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections, Applicants have amended the claims so as to expedite prosecution of the present application. However, such amendments should not be interpreted as the surrender of any subject matter, and Applicants expressly reserve the right to present the original version of any of the amended claims in any future divisional or continuation applications from the present application.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 15, and 25 to further emphasize certain aspects of the invention. As discussed herein, the claim amendments are fully supported throughout the Specification. No new matter has been introduced by the claim amendments. Independent Claims 13 and 23 have been cancelled.

Aspects of Applicants' Invention

It may be helpful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited references. One embodiment of the invention, as typified by amended Claim 15, is a method of calibrating an imaging display system.

The method can include forwarding a display test pattern from a display adapter to a display of the display system. The display test pattern can include a measurement field comprising approximately 10% of a total number of pixels displayed by the display and the measurement field can be placed at different regions of a display screen of the display.

The method also can include causing the measurement field to be stepped through a sequence of values from zero and increasing at each step up to a maximum display driving level (DDL), as well as and receiving luminance and color values from a plurality of photosensors associated with the display screen. The photosensors detect distinct luminance and color levels at the different regions of the screen.

The method further can include determining, from the detected luminance and color levels, a plurality of luminance and color correction factors by comparing the detected luminance and color values to reference luminance and color data; and applying the determined luminance and color correction factors to the different regions of the screen so as to adjust luminance and color of said screen at the different regions, each region spanned by a corresponding measurement field.

See, e.g., Specification, paragraphs [0017] and [0027] to [0030].

The Claims Define Over The Prior Art

Tanada describes a self light emitting device that can detect the brightness on a pixel basis and make corrections to ensure a uniform display image. In contrast, the present invention teaches how to detect not only brightness, but also contrast and color to ensure that the display meets a designed calibration specification (noting that the term

"luminance" is not limited to brightness). Also, the present invention is not limited to self light emitting devices.

It was asserted in the Office Action that the Examiner is interpreting each pixel of Tanada to be a small region of the display screen because a pixel is inherently less than 10% of the screen.

The language of the claims has been modified to make it even more explicit that in the present invention, a display test pattern includes a measurement field comprising approximately 10% of a total number of pixels displayed by the display and the measurement field can be placed at different regions of the display screen. Therefore, a pixel of Tanada cannot be considered as a region in the sense of the present invention.

It was also asserted in the Office Action that paragraph [0106], lines 8-11, and paragraph [0125] of Tanada disclose causing the measurement field to be stepped through a sequence of values from zero and increasing at each step up to a maximum display driving level (DDL).

It is described in paragraph [0106], lines 8-11, of Tanada that the standard brightnesses need not be limited to one certain gray scale, but standard brightnesses may be stored for a plurality of gray scales. It is not clear how this is related to causing the measurement field to be stepped through a sequence of values from zero and increasing at each step up to a maximum display driving level. It is noted that a DDL is a digital value given as an input to a display system to produce a luminance. A plot of the luminance vs. DDL then can be generated to model the characteristic curve of the display system over the luminance range. The plot of the measured luminance characteristic curve then can be compared to a grayscale standard display function. See Specification, paragraph [0005] of the instant application. Clearly, the standard brightnesses of Tanada have nothing to do with the concept of DDL.

Paragraph [0125] of Tanada describes that it is not possible to make further additions when the input is "111111" and it is not necessary to perform subtractions when

the input is "000000". It is not clear how this has anything to do with the concept of DDL as explained above.

Accordingly, the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of Claims 1, 15, and 25, as amended. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended Claims 1, 15, and 25 define over the prior art. Furthermore, as each of the remaining claims depends from Claim 1, 15, or 25 while reciting additional features, Applicants further respectfully submit that the remaining claims likewise define over the prior art.

Applicants thus respectfully request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **June 18, 2008**

/Richard A. Hinson/
Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Yonghong Chen, Registration No. 56,150
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000